

REMARKS

The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Gray for the courteous and helpful discussions during the Examiner's Interview held of December 16, 2011. The substance of the interview was a discussion of the Yoshikawa et al., Preissman and Palasis et al. references. The following is meant to advance the discussions held during the interview.

By this amendment, claim 16 has been amended to insert the term "a metal reinforcement material consisting essentially of", to clarify that the metal reinforcement is essentially limited to three or four wires.

New claims 31-34 have been added to duplicate dependent claims 17 and 18, to define the needle in the syringe and connector combinations.

In view of the amendment, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are now moot. Indeed, the primary reference to Yoshikawa et al. discloses a number of potential polymers which can be reinforced by bundles of combustible fibers occupying a significant volume of the syringe. The purpose of Yoshiwawa et al. is to obtain sufficient stiffness and at the same time sufficient toughness to withstand actual usage, as for example an intravenous needle, and at the same time to being capable of being

disposaed as combustibile waste after use (col. 1, lines 39-43).

In contrast, the present invention seeks to solve the technical problem of providing needles that can be sterilized and pyrogenized y being heated up to 250 C for 1 h (page 1, lines 12-18 of the specification).

Prior to the invention, plastic needles could not be heated under such conditions without being deformed (page 2, lines 1-2).

The critical combination of PEEK with the three or four stainless steel reinforcing wires wherein said wires are distributed to define an identical center angle, as claimed, solves this new technical problem for the first time. The cited prior art does not hint at or disclose this technical problem.

In Yoshikwawa et al. PEEK is listed but not exemplified, which cannot provide the necessary teaching.

Palasis et al. in paragraph 86 although listing PEEK in a similar list of polymers essentially refers to the Yoshikawa et al. patent (paragraph [0086]. The last sentence mentions that metal or ceramic reinforcements may be included in addition to combustibile fibers, but this reference does not teach the specific combination of PEEK with metal or ceramic

reinforcements, or even that the number of metal wires should be limited to three or four.

In addition, such a combination, as claimed, is not obvious in view of the statement made by Preissman that the tubing wall should be without reinforcing coil when the tubing is made of PEEK (cl. 9, lines 44-45).

In view of the above, it is submitted that the prior art does not disclose the invention, as presently claimed.

The rejection should therefore be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted



Date: December 23, 2011

Malcolm J. MacDonald
Reg. No. 40,250
Tel: (703) 837-9600 Ex. 24